

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 12-cr-20364

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

WILLIAM WRIGHT TOPPING, JR.,

Defendant.

/

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S (1) MOTION FOR EARLY  
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE (ECF No. 43); AND (2)  
MOTION FOR THE APOINTMENT OF COUNSEL (ECF No. 42)**

On October 29, 2012, Defendant William Wright Topping, Jr. pled guilty to one count of receipt of child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2). (*See* Rule 11 Plea Agreement, ECF No. 12.) Topping received a sentence of 60 months. (*See* Judgment, ECF No. 23.) Topping is currently on supervised release.

Proceeding *pro se*, Topping has now filed two motions: (1) a request for the appointment of counsel to assist Topping “get Off probation early,” (*see* Mot., ECF No. 42); and (2) a request for “an early Probation Release,” (*see* Mot., ECF No. 43). For the reasons provided below, the Court is denying both motions.

The Court begins with Topping’s second motion. The Court construes Topping’s request as a motion for termination of his supervised release. Such motions are governed by 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). That statute provides as follows:

The court may, after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7)--

(1) terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.

18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1).

The Court declines to grant Topping's motion for early termination of his supervised release. The Court concludes, after considering the relevant statutory factors, that early termination of Topping's supervised release is not warranted by Topping's conduct nor by the interest of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). The Court believes that the public and Topping will benefit from him serving the remainder of his term, where he will continue to have access to the resources and support that supervised release has to offer. Moreover, the nature of Topping's prior violation of the terms of his supervised release further persuades the Court that early termination is not warranted here. Topping's motion for early termination (ECF No. 43) is therefore **DENIED**.

Additionally, Topping has requested that the Court appoint counsel to assist him with his motion for early termination. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 42.) The Court is not

persuaded that such appointment is necessary or appropriate here, and therefore Topping's motion (ECF No. 42) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: January 19, 2022

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on January 19, 2022, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan  
Case Manager  
(810) 341-9761